CGIAR Research Program
Aquatic Agricultural Systems
Roll-Out Handbook
Ver. 1.0, May 2012

Making a difference in the lives of the poor

RESEARCH
PROGRAM ON

Aquatic
Agricultural
Systems

CGIAR

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is a guide to procedures and practices that should be observed during hub roll-out by the teams coordinating the planning, implementation and reporting of the activities of the CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS-CRP). Given that the program promises to change the way research in development is planned, implemented and reported, it is important that similar practices be observed from the start. This will assist later cross-hub comparisons.

This is version 1.0 of the handbook and is made available as a pdf for convenience. The current version is being continuously updated based on feedback from implementation of the first set of hub roll outs. We expect that the experience of implementing the roll out during 2012 will result in revisions to the content. The last activity of the handbook is an After Action Review in early 2013, revisions may appear soon afterwards.

The hub is the basic operational unit of the CRP. We define a hub as a geographic location providing a focus for innovation, learning and impact through action research. A hub typically has fairly homogeneous biophysical characteristics and production systems and presents a set of common challenges, opportunities and intervention points. It generally aligns with administrative units, either provinces or districts. Our choice of hubs in each country focuses the program in those areas where poverty is high and people depend on aquatic agricultural systems for their livelihoods.

The AAS-CRP has other planning processes to address country-level or cross-country research-in-development activities. Examples of these are the program-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) planning, communication and scaling up, or a multi-country research activity such as an analysis of regional trade. Those planning processes are not addressed in this handbook.

The hubs are the fundamental implementation and management unit of the program. The participatory, consultative philosophy of the program depends on the sound establishment of the hubs, for which good planning is crucial. The goals of the planning phase are to arrive at a mutually agreed and prioritized work plan, which captures the research-in-development priorities of stakeholders and achieves a degree of coordination among existing efforts and new activities that the CRP team and partners will undertake.

Gender: The AAS CRP has ambitious goals of achieving gender transformational change. Gender mainstreaming, which begins during planning, is a first step towards that goal. Thus many of the activities during the roll-out steps include special considerations for assuring gender integration, adopting a variety of approaches that can be responsive, transformational, neutral or sensitive, for example.

Knowledge Management (KM): KM – communications, information management and M&E – provides processes and practices that are critical to roll-out success. Most activities require some form of communication to be successful. Much of the roll-out process is about gathering information and making it available to people at the right time in the right way. Monitoring and evaluation supports the sense-making and learning that allow roll-out in each hub to adapt to local contexts, respond to opportunity and know whether things are working or not. The KM process, in particular the monitoring, evaluation and corresponding information management, provides the data for action research on which to effectively build coalitions of actors that use agricultural research to tackle pressing development challenges. Knowledge management is captured in two activities put under planning: 1.4 Documentation and monitoring of roll-out process; and 1.5 Partner engagement and communications.

The Hub teams, the Program Support Unit (PSU) and the Policy, Economics and Social Science (PESS) team require performance information to:

1. Set up and run hub programs-of-work;

2. Provide data for action research on how to do (1);

3. Meet the information needs of the Program Leadership Team (PLT), the Program Oversight Panel (POP) and the Consortium.

Information will be gathered in response to key performance questions, which form the basis of the AAS M&E system. Some questions are already identified although they will evolve, as will M&E, as AAS roll-out progresses. Indicators that will help answer the questions will be developed during hub roll-out.

How we conduct the planning process is nearly as important as the set of products that result from it. The AAS CRP has a strong focus on achieving outcomes. One pathway to assuring that the outcomes are sustainable is to assure program participant and stakeholder priorities are well aligned. Various activities in the planning process are designed to build that buy-in of the program priorities. The planning process also includes specific moments for feedback from the full range of program stakeholders and for evaluation of program design.

The program as a whole is a break from business as usual for a CGIAR initiative. As such the conduct of the program is an experiment about research-in-development effectiveness. The program implementation philosophy stresses partner participation, transparency and accountability –three aspects that rely on good communication. Program strategy embraces adaptive management, gender integration and effective partnerships. Achievement of these relies on adequate monitoring and

evaluation, knowledge management, and regular feedback. The activities in the planning process are aligned with the philosophy and strategy and intended to support the creation of the program culture and management tools to underpin these processes.

Included among the planning activities and outputs are requests for process documentation.

A typical hub roll-out should take six to eight months. Major products at the end of the roll-out include a long-term hub strategy, a three-year medium-term plan and one-year operational plan. However, given the complex systems (social, ecological, institutional) in which the program is implemented, and the consultative nature of implementation, the end of the roll-out does not mean the end of planning. Especially during the first cycles of implementation, the planning dreams of program participants will be grounded in reality and adjustments will probably be needed. Thus the first 12 months after the completion of the start-up phase can be considered as an extension of the planning phase. The program management procedures build in feedback so changes in the plan can be considered and implemented in a timely manner.

The schedule described in this handbook consists of four distinct steps: planning, scoping, diagnosis and design.

- **Planning** takes about a month and uses this handbook to develop individual hub roll-out plans including a Gantt chart, resource scheduling and indicative budget.
- **Scoping** takes about three months. It confirms and updates existing analysis of the hub development challenge with key stakeholders, identifies potential partners and characterizes potential research areas. It culminates in a Stakeholder Consultation Workshop.
- **Diagnosis** also takes about three months. It takes output from scoping to develop a hub-level theory of change for identifying opportunities for research. Communities are selected and engaged in a visioning and action planning process to identify grass-roots demand for research. Research supply is identified in an intervention matrix.
- **Design** takes about two months. It is a synthesis step in which research supply is matched to hub- and community-level demand, and gaps are identified. This analysis is validated in a design workshop as part of agreeing to a six-year vision, a three-year plan and a one-year operational plan.

A tabular summary of the activities can be found in Annex 1 of this publication.

The contents of the handbook follow the sequence of activities. The presentation of each activity contains a brief statement of purpose and description, suggested method or methods, and expected outputs. Where feasible, links are provided to websites or to pdf documents on the AAS website.

Finally, good research-in-development practice and good science makes use of prior knowledge. Whenever it is present, existing data, analysis or other supporting material should be used. If appropriate, the existing documentation can serve to complete the activity without the program conducting work to repeat it.

Partnerships: An important objective of the roll-out process is to build new partnerships and consolidate existing ones. Some of these may be formalized through MOUs and subsequent contracts for work. The appropriate moment to formalize these is left to the country leader. For some this may even occur at the very start of the process.

Fundraising: During roll-out, funding opportunities should be constantly considered. A status check of this topic will be included in the agenda of the fortnightly Roll Out Working Group (ROWG) conference call.

Initial country, hub and development challenge selection

Country, Hub and Development Challenge selection was made during the development of the AAS Program Proposal. Supporting documents included:

- AAS Proposal
- Annex 1: Proposal Development
- Annex 2: Gender Partnerships, Participatory Gender Tools for Out-Scaling, Gender Mainstreaming in Research Themes, Gender Strategy Monitoring and Evaluation
- Annex 3: Initial Analysis of Development Challenges, Hypotheses of Change and Key Research Questions for Program Hubs in Bangladesh
- Annex 4: Country Research Questions by Program Theme
- Annex 5: Country Details

STEP 1 – PLANNING

The objective of roll-out planning is to clarify outputs expected, human and financial resources needed and, timeline to be followed. The hub Roll-Out Plan should be reasonably documented and uploaded into an agreed repository (i.e. Google docs for the first three hubs).

The successful implementation of the activities in the steps below is subject to various risks. These may include: lack of documentation, failure to find existing documentation, omission of key stakeholders, lack of participation in workshops or other events, and not contracting the right people with the right skill sets at the right time to complete the work. The recommended hub roll-out timeline is ambitious. Part of developing the country roll out plans is to identify the risks for each step and the strategies to mitigate them.

Timeline: About a month.

Activity 1.1 Develop Roll-Out Handbook

Purpose and description: An on-line resource to guide the roll-out process

Actors and participants: Roll-Out Working Group

Input: AAS Proposal

Methods: Collaboratively developed as a living document on-line. Even though we will treat the handbook as a living document, we will manage it like software. At some point we will declare a Version 1 and put the document into a pdf format. Subsequent changes will then be managed as sub-versions until some major change merits designation as Version 2.

Output: The handbook itself – this document.

Activity 1.2 Program leadership team meeting

Purpose and description: Bring PLT together for the first time to set team roles and responsibilities, form working groups and begin roll-out planning

Actors and participants: PLT members

Input: AAS Proposal; Handbook

Method: Facilitated workshop

Output: Meeting outputs are on the Program's Wikispace

Activity 1.3 Roll-Out Planning Workshop

Purpose and description: A planning workshop to finalize country hub roll-out project planning.

Actors and participants: AAS PLT Roll-Out Working Group

Input: PLT Meeting outputs are on the Program's Wikispace

Method: Facilitated workshop.

Output: Roll-Out Plan – usual stuff including work plan, activities, outputs, risk analysis, GANTT chart, budget. Country Wiki (Wikispaces) to post data, literature, and outputs of the start-up activities.

Activity 1.4 Documentation and monitoring of roll-out process

Purpose and description: Document and monitoring of roll-out process for learning and accountability purposes

Actors and participants: Country leader, country information manager, M&E point person

Input: Information on all roll-out processes, trip reports, workshop reports, After Action Reviews (AARs) after each activity

Method: Expectation to produce reports after activities, trips, events, meetings. Use of in-country Google Folder, Wikispaces or DropBox as appropriate. Regular Roll Out Working Group meetings; filling out of a Learning Journal.

Output: Processes documented and placed in the appropriate repositories, progress monitored and corrective action taken; information necessary for programmatic reporting requirements; data required to answer action research questions on roll-out

Communication: Contact and inform relevant country stakeholders on AAS where to find information of interest to them is being kept. Share evaluation findings.

Activity 1.5 Partner engagement and communications

Purpose and description: Build and maintain network capital, bring partners along. Assure adherence to local protocols such as gaining permissions to visit villages or talk with villagers.

Actors and participants: Country leader; hub leader; key partners (the usual suspects)

Input: Existing partnerships, network capital

Method: Communication, working the back channels, lobbying and convincing. Good partner engagement results in positive collaboration outcomes. Documentation of partner engagement is an important knowledge management process and will eventually be helpful when measuring the effectiveness of the AAS approach.

Output: Signed MOUs; strengthened partnerships

Communication: Contact and inform relevant country stakeholders on AAS, its intention, approach and roll-out activities.

STEP 2 – SCOPING

The purpose of scoping is to confirm and update the analysis of the hub development challenge carried out during the development of the AAS CRP Proposal and begin building stakeholder commitment to tackling the hub development challenge. The initial scoping was completed in 2010 so the revisit will be anywhere from 24 to 36 months later and probably will include different individuals in the scoping team.

A key conceptual consideration for the scoping step is the definition of the development challenge (or a development opportunity) that can be addressed within the context of the CRP. The Hub teams need to be clear that the CRP is not going to do everything everywhere. The CRP is not an integrated rural development project.

The scoping step comprises three distinct activities:
1. A national-level analysis to confirm AAS CRP relevance with development priorities;

2. An information gathering hub-level visit;

3. A stakeholder consultation workshop that validates and extends the analysis of the scoping report.

The national-level analysis can be conducted only once and should be sufficient to serve each of the hubs in the country. An exception may be when hubs are established years apart and the policy context changes in the interim.

Timeline: The Scoping step takes about three months. Depending on the expertise available, Activities 1 and 2 can run simultaneously and should be completed in about one month. The stakeholder consultation workshop should be conducted after the completion of the first two activities.

Activity 2.1 Analysis of the AAS Program in the national setting

Purpose: This activity is intended to provide basic information on the circumstances within which the CRP will operate. It should also provide an assessment of the relevance of the Program for the national strategies and plans, e.g. poverty reduction strategies and basic indicators such as poverty, hunger and food and nutrition status. The subjects of analysis are at the macro level and provide baseline of national level indicators – which include human development and gender empowerment, the policy context including any gender/women related policies, power relationships, governance characteristics and other factors relevant to program planning. This information serves several purposes: it can provide justifications for actions, serve as baselines for future impact assessments, and highlights the alignment with government priorities to assure their cooperation and support.

Make sure that the program, as it moves ahead, is grounded in national priorities and within existing policies. Because it will be addressing issues in an awareness of policy context it has a better chance in scaling out.

The program must address the tension of working at the community level while aiming for impact at scale. This analysis will help to align the program with national ambitions and keep it on track.

The activity should identify where AAS can contribute to national-level processes, taking into account drivers of change (national-level levers of change that the AAS program might activate).

The document is part of an *ex-ante* impact assessment.

Description: The objective of the activity is to answer, with supporting quantitative data where available, the questions listed below. These questions are adapted from an OECD guide.

1. What is the overall poverty and hunger situation in the country, with particular focus on the proposed hubs?

   - What baseline information is available – including, for example, number of people covered, grouped into poor and non-poor, men/women, young/old and other categories of vulnerable people as deemed relevant to the Program?

2. What are the dimensions of poverty and food and security in the country, with special focus on the hub? Are they gendered, dependent on hierarchy, age, birth order, season?

   - The dimensions of poverty relative to the Program are described in Box 1 on page 4 of the AAS proposal.

3. What are the existing national poverty reduction strategies, or other relevant plans and strategies (e.g., regarding gender or women, youth and child welfare/development; addressing malnutrition/undernutrition) important to the priorities of the AAS program?

- Highlight the priority given to areas encompassed by the hubs, and any joint programming discussions, decisions or documents involving donor(s) and development partner(s).

- What is the community empowerment approach used in different government or non-governmental agencies? (This is useful for our partner Constellation as a baseline for our ambitions of empowerment)

4. How do the key AAS Program objectives align to national strategies?

Actors and participants: A designated member of the country planning team or a consultant will be contracted for the task. An encyclopedic report is unnecessary, but the contents must be focused on information directly useful to the AAS program.

Inputs: AAS CRP proposal; initial country scoping reports; existing data and literature

Methods: The national-level analysis is primarily a desk study utilizing secondary data and existing literature.

Recall that the overriding philosophy of the program is to utilize existing work wherever it is available. The multi-lateral organizations or bi-lateral donors have probably commissioned such studies at some point. They well may reside in the hard-to-find gray literature and program desk officers or other contacts may well be the best avenue for obtaining them.

The sources of information used should also be documented, noting their quality and where gaps need filling. This is important for deciding whether information is sufficient to enable an informed decision or whether further data collection and analysis are required. This is also an important contribution towards establishing a baseline for the Program to use in monitoring progress towards its higher-level objectives. Information sources might be from existing baselines such as those of the USAID *Feed the Future* program or the DFID *Research into Use* program. Special efforts should be made to obtain gender-desegregated data where they exist.

Output: A written report and data sets, made available on the country wikispace. Specific output targeted towards the Stakeholder Consultation Workshop. A completed After Action Review.

Sub-activity 2.1.1: Drivers of change (DoC) analysis

Purpose and description: An analysis of the big transformational processes (national or regional macro-economic trends, climate change adaptation efforts, governance reforms, civil society movements) that is most likely to influence the success or failure of the program in addressing the development challenge in the medium term (3 to 5 years). While the overall Activity 2.1 aims at describing the current national context for program implementation, the Drivers of Change (DoC) analysis focuses more specifically on "how change is occurring within the country, in other words: 'What is driving change'"(Warrener 2004).

Actors and participants: A designated member of the country planning team or a consultant contracted for the task has lead responsibility. Ideally, this person should have a well-established prior understanding of the country's political and institutional dynamics. However, the analysis should not be done as a 'stand-alone' activity; rather, it should be an integral part of the consultations undertaken with key stakeholders at the national level, including program collaborators.

Inputs: AAS-CRP proposal: initial country scoping reports; existing data and literature; background information as detailed in Activity 2.1.

Methods: The primary value of the analysis comes not from new information, but rather informed judgment about the description of key trends and how these are likely to affect program outcomes and impacts. For this, consultation with knowledgeable stakeholders representing different perspectives is essential. Ideally, this will take place in several stages: a preliminary series of individual or small-group meetings to solicit views from key stakeholders in government, civil society, the private sector, and the development aid community in-country; next, a focus group discussion gathering of a subset of those consulted (perhaps 8 to 12 people) to review and deliberate on a preliminary analysis; finally, a broader validation and refining of the analysis as part of the Stakeholder Consultation Workshop (Activity 2.4). Among the population groups to consider are the opinions of students and children at different levels. Given the long-term nature of the CRP planning, the opinions of the younger population groups can be important.

T**he analysis considers:** a) main trends affecting the development challenge; b) key actors influencing these trends or responding to them at national level; c) governance characteristics that determine how these different actors interact in decision-making. (These categories correspond, roughly, to the structural features, agents, and institutions, as outlined by Warrener (2004).)

For an overview of DoC, see Warrener, D. 2004. The Drivers of Change Approach. Overseas Development Institute. http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/3721.pdf

For guidance on analysis of the governance context, see Ratner, B.D., Barman, B., Cohen, P., Mam, K., Nagoli, J. and Allison, E.H. (2012) Strengthening governance

across scales in aquatic agricultural systems. Working Paper. The CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems, Penang, Malaysia. AAS-2012-10.

Outputs: A brief report (suggested 15 pages max) that describes the main conclusions, and the implications for program design. An appendix should describe key persons consulted and the methods of consultation.

Communication: Inform program collaborators and other interested parties at national level that the analysis will be undertaken; extend an opportunity to provide written and in-person feedback on a draft; include in Stakeholder Consultation Workshop and refine thereafter.

Activity 2.2: Hub scoping

Purpose and description: To revisit the hubs identified during the 2010 consultations for the AAS-CRP proposal planning and confirm or modify the development challenges identified then. The tasks of the team are to:

- revisit original choice of hub development challenge(s) and validate or revise them based on current knowledge and information;
- identify key development processes and other drivers that could transform the hub and with which CRP will therefore need to engage;
- identify overarching research questions that can inform development efforts in response to these challenges and opportunities;
- contact the people visited in the initial hub visits to apprise them of the current status with the Program and signal the intent to visit the hub again;
- identify important stakeholders and confirm priorities with them;
- inventory existing governmental, non-governmental and community-based development efforts and screen them to identify potential collaborators for the Program;
- inventory potential program collaborators and their roles;
- make preliminary recommendations for program priorities for target communities.

Actors and participants: A team of three to five scientists and development specialists (including the country/gender focal points) and development practitioners with substantive knowledge of the focal hub and with the AAS-CRP program will conduct the scoping exercise. A gender specialist should be a team member. The leader should be the CRP country leader or the CRP hub leader.

Inputs: AAS Proposal and initial 2010 hub visit reports where they exist.

Methods: The team will visit the hub location for a period of five to ten days, depending on the requirements of each hub.

The TOR for scoping team members is included as Annex 2.

Tasks for the scoping team include:
- Identify challenges and opportunities using questions that reference the six research-for-development themes defined in the AAS Program Proposal. This will confirm the development challenges and the capacity of the program to address them. See Annex 4 in the Proposal for examples.
- Start a preliminary inventory and map of recent past, present and planned investments in development (including those related to women, youth and child development or welfare) by government, non-government and community-based organizations or agencies (see here for template). This will provide an initial look at the scope of interventions in the hub and the partnership landscape. This task begins to build the intervention matrix. The team should collect basic descriptive information on the interventions.
- Identify potential links with ongoing and future investments. Contact and discuss specific partnerships where appropriate. This will result in a first set of recommendations in those areas where the program on AAS can contribute most effectively and add value to the activities of partners. This will also identify partners to participate in the inception workshops.
- Identify existing data suitable for baseline information for performance monitoring and impact assessment.
- Recommend a potential set of target areas. Considerations include: appropriateness of relevant stratifications of the program research for development themes such as agro-ecology, market access, farming system, food, nutrition and health, and policy or governance environment. In addition to the program research themes, other criteria will also be important. These might include: considerations for counterfactuals for eventual impact assessment, cross-hub comparisons for learning bigger lessons, and partnership environment for scaling up.
- From within the target areas, the scoping team should recommend priority communities. Criteria for selecting these communities could include:
  1. issues that are of wide concern across the hub;
  2. potential for partnerships;
  3. potential to capitalize on current development efforts or those planned for the future;
  4. sites that present issues that will tap into AAS expertise or draw on the ability of the program to catalyze the necessary expertise;
  5. sites that present issues that are "doable";
  6. sites that present the greatest degrees of asset and income poverty, marginalization and vulnerability.
- Recommend invitees to the Stakeholder Consultation Workshop

Outputs: A scoping report. The report outline could follow the task list above. It is important that we emerge from the scoping step with an actionable development challenge/opportunity. A completed After Action Review.

Communication: A communiqué or message back to those involved in the hub visit thanking them for their support and participation and advising on next steps. Make this contextually appropriate (written, verbal, golf date).

Activity 2.3: Invitation to stakeholder consultation workshop participants

Purpose and description: Based on recommendation from the Hub Scoping Report, invite participants to Workshop.

Inputs: Hub scoping report; debrief with hub scoping leader.

Methods: Country leader decision, with view to getting the right balance (local, hub, national, research, development, in country versus out of country observers). A guidance note (Guidance Note #1) on assembling small working group to deliberate on and identify the most effective set of participants to invite has been developed. This makes a shared undertaking and builds legitimacy.

Outputs: List of participants, including AAS partners (using their own resources). Invitations must be sent at least one month before the workshop. A completed After Action Review.

Communication: Provide appropriate information for the participants so that they can meaningfully engage in the Workshop. Gauge the level of expertise of the different participants in applying the techniques planned for the workshop and if inadequate, arrange for some capacity development.

Activity 2.4: Stakeholder consultation workshop

Purpose and description: This workshop is a first feedback event. It brings together a broad range of stakeholders and takes them through a process where they identify and develop a common vision of success, also nominate the opportunities and constraints (within the areas of our development challenge). Together we validate what has emerged from the scoping study and national study.

This workshop should build stakeholder commitment to tackling the development challenge through producing shared vision of success and a broadly agreed constraints and opportunities list.

Using appropriate participatory techniques the workshop should:

- agree on priority development challenge the program should address in hub;
- develop a shared vision of success based on tackling the development challenge(s);
- identify, validate and endorse constraints and opportunities facing the hub in relation to the challenges;
- identify important information needs to be addressed for preparation of full program design;
- build partner commitments;
- finalize criteria for selecting communities;
- validate network mapping and inventory of organizations working in hub, and
- identify the communication and information needs and expectations of the partners (communication assessment and analysis).

Actors and participants: Organized by Country Leader; participants invited as part of activity 2.3.

Inputs: Hub scoping report, national diagnostic desk study, clear annotated agenda outlining expectations of the workshop.

Methods: To have a range of stakeholders and opinions in the group, we must make purposeful choices about who is invited. With these groups we unpack the opportunities and constraints around the development challenges. The opportunities are prioritized. The stakeholder initiative inventory is validated and added to when information is missing. Criteria for selection of communities are discussed and agreed. As we get an idea of the opportunities and where the initiatives are working, we will begin to identify candidate communities.

This is a three-day workshop held at an appropriate location in the hub. The intent is to maximize participation of local stakeholders.

Approximately 30 stakeholders should be invited. We caution against having more than this number in the workshop, as management of the larger group and giving space to small group work and report-back becomes intractable. The workshop should be held in the hub. See Annex 3 for a suggested agenda.

Special considerations should be paid to manage the meeting to maximize the potential for ownership. Perhaps the way to handle the team-building aspects of the meeting is to separate the idea of the program from the entity that is the management team of the program.

Output: The proceedings report of the workshop. This contains the analysis and conclusions of the bullet points above. A completed After Action Review.

Communication: Proceedings of workshop shared with participants, allowing for additional comments and input. Final workshop report made available and accessible (Wikispace or some other document repository).

STEP 3 – DIAGNOSIS

The scoping step worked at national and hub regional levels. The diagnosis step starts to focus more sharply on the hub and includes community-level work as well. The hub and community activities can be implemented simultaneously.

The hub is both a regional- and community-level concept. The agro-ecoregions that comprise a hub may contain dozens or hundreds of communities. The analysis during this step gathers information at both levels. The action research approach of the Program implies that we will work directly with a set of target communities in the hub. Action research seeks to create participative research communities. It seeks to engage those who may otherwise be subjects of research or recipients of interventions as inquiring co-researchers. Action research thus starts in the planning process and it should account for their interests and priorities.

Purpose and description: To engage communities in identifying their priorities for a research-for-development program, expressed through community action plans.

To refine and deepen the analysis of the proposed hub research-for-development program produced by the scoping report, relevant stakeholders (ensuring a gender balance) should be included in participatory processes. Tools used should include appropriate integration of gender. The diagnosis should be reached by convening meetings of relevant stakeholders in the hub and seeking their assistance in identifying constraints and opportunities, potential partners, criteria for selecting target communities, appropriate communication channels, information needs and expectations.

Actors and participants: This planning step may take several months to complete and will be dominated by extensive field work utilizing a variety of information-gathering and data-collection techniques. The team will consist of four or five individuals with expertise in research for development issues important in the hub, participatory techniques and data analysis.

Timeline: The diagnosis step should take about three months.

Activity 3.1 Select and build the diagnosis and design team; build the guiding coalition

Purpose and description: The intent of this activity is to designate and build a team with responsibility for leadership during the diagnosis and design (DD) steps. The DD team in turn has a responsibility to communicate and champion AAS in their respective organizations and build a guiding coalition prepared to work together to tackle the AAS Hub Development Challenge. In addition to a diversity of perspectives and skills, gender balance should be a goal for the DD team and a guide in determining coalition membership.

Participants and actors:

Guiding coalition: This group should comprise representatives of the communities, organizations and initiatives likely to be involved in the AAS program-of-work. They should be prepared for collaborative action to tackle the AAS Hub Development Challenge.

AAS diagnosis and design (DD) team: A subset of the guiding coalition tasked with program design. Team members have a key job to communicate and champion AAS in their respective networks and build the guiding coalition.

Inputs: Experience and reflection of roll-out working group and country leader on the level of leadership and performance demonstrated by partners. Terms of reference for the DD team are outlined in Annex 4.

Method: Based on interest and skills identified during the scoping step, select the design team (likely size of 5–8, including the country gender and M&E/information management focal points) who will lead program design efforts; as also choose representatives from the guiding coalition of stakeholders who will implement the work. The Team Leader (likely the Country Leader) will conform and lead the team. For those DD team members that are not WorldFish employees a MOU or a more-or-less formalized contract should be established, specifying the expected level of participation and providing estimates of time expected for the roll-out oversight and participation in events.

The guiding coalition members are decision members, those who can allocate resources from among the key stakeholders. These individuals will be gradually identified from the diagnostic analyses.

Outputs: The designated team with signed or publicly made verbal commitments. A completed After Action Review.

Sub-activity 3.1.1 Training in AAS concepts

Purpose and description: The AAS-CRP will utilize approaches to implementation and include subject matter themes that are not familiar to many researchers or development experts in the AAS countries. Several of these concepts are widely used and are approaches that have different interpretations. The intent of the training is to standardize our definition of these concepts and approaches and improve skills in them.

Participants and actors: PSU, PESS, DD team, Community Facilitators, other key implementation participants

Inputs: Trainers; AAS conceptual framework

Method: This will be a three- or four-day workshop held in the hub (or the capital city) for the DD team and associated key participants. The curriculum will cover topics including gender, action research, monitoring and evaluation, ethics, theory of change.

Output: Capacity, vision and team cohesion built, communication tools and key messages identified to support the DD team to communicate and champion AAS. A completed After Action Review.

Activity 3.2 Confirm community selection

Purpose and Description: To finalize the selection of the communities.

Actors and participants: Diagnosis and Design Team plus support from AAS roll-out work group.

Inputs: Information from Scoping, especially from the Stakeholder Consultation Workshop.

Method: Utilize the selection criteria confirmed in the previous activity. This is taking the recommendations and in consultation with the AAS team and Constellation agreeing on the definite communities to engage as direct collaborators in the hub. The various community selection criteria, priorities and assumptions are documented.

The intent is to establish a network of communities of sufficient scale to ensure tangible impact of the development challenges identified. To do this we select communities in the following ways:

1. First define development challenge

2. Look at areas where development challenge is most pressing

3. Within those areas identify gradients

4. Identify partner organizations and their reach

5. Then make selection (selection in clusters along those gradients)

The selection is across the gradient and within reach of the partner organizations. It includes a density-dependent relationship of the population of the area we work in – for example, more communities in Bangladesh than in Zambia or Solomon Islands.

An implementation example from Bangladesh might be to approach CARE, which is working with 500 communities in the southwest area. Ask to collaborate in an appropriate number of the communities. This embeds the AAS initiative within the development context of CARE.

When we have that density it allows other actors to build upon it. A set of FAQs for community selection has been developed.

Outputs: Recommendations and documentation of selection process for participating communities made available and accessible. A completed After Action Review.

Sub-activity 3.2.1 Identify and train community facilitators

Purpose and description: The community facilitators (also called local facilitators) are the main entry point for the Constellation approach (Community Life Competence Process) to community engagement. Constellation provides a four- to five-day training for these facilitators.The Constellation coaches also provide on-site support by accompanying trained facilitators to assist the process steps in one or two communities per hub. The Constellation coaches also provide distance support to the community facilitators throughout the roll-out process.

The trained community facilitators engage during the hub-roll out process. They assist the communities to define their shared visions, assess their own strengths and areas to work on, and develop action plans. As the program moves to implementation they continue to engage with the program and provide a bridge to the community.

The selection of facilitators should result in a gender- and age-balanced team. They must be locally recruited (but typically not from the communities themselves). The community facilitators will support a broader network of communities. They will work in a team of at least two. Each team may work in several communities during program implementation. They can be employees of WorldFish or other key stakeholders.

Two key roles:

Community facilitators: Their entry to the community is brokered by a designated Bridge, they keep returning to facilitate the development of community action plans during the roll-out process.

The Bridge: This person (or more than one) comes from within the community and helps coordinate the process. This individual keeps the light burning in the community, believes in the program and is willing to promote it.

Actors and participants: DD team selects partner Community Based Organizations. Partner CBOs select community facilitators. Constellation coaches train them. Selected DD team members join the training.

Inputs: A candidate selection process defined and implemented. Qualifications criteria defined for future facilitators. The Constellation training module that incorporated gender analysis.

Methods: This sub-activity addresses several training needs. Constellation will run a five-day training course on their community engagement processes. AAS should determine additional training as needed (action research, gender mainstreaming, or other topics).

Local facilitators should also be trained in basic qualitative data documentation to capture process-type information.

Outputs: Gender-balanced team of local facilitators trained in the community engagement process and AAS concepts. DD team is able to provide support and supervise the facilitators in the process. A completed After Action Review.

Activity 3.3 Community visioning and action planning

Purpose and description: This activity is our main vehicle to prime communities for a productive relationship with the AAS program. The activity consists of a series of meetings using the Community Life Competence Process (CLCP). Communities that have completed a CLCP cycle are better equipped to work together towards their shared vision of improvement. The AAS program will seek to do this in about 10 communities per hub. These communities become sites for action research by the program.

Actors and participants: Communities, Constellation coaches, local facilitators, selected AAS DD team members as participant observers.

Inputs: Trained community facilitators, bridge person(s) per community, generic self-assessment framework developed at the Stakeholders Consultation Workshop.

Method: Constellation coaches accompany community facilitators in the community visioning exercises in one or two communities per hub. A facilitator leader (perhaps directly supervised by the hub leader) will also be trained. Afterwards the facilitators complete the visioning in the

remaining communities (whatever number this may be). The quality of their work is supervised by the facilitator leader.

The methods for this step are documented in the Constellation website. There should be two facilitators per community. These two can oversee the community engagement work in several communities. From visioning to action planning typically takes three or four half-day encounters per community. For communities without an existing partnership, we may need more than one visit to mobilize the participants before starting the visioning process.

If communities have previously undertaken visioning with other partners, the entry point for AAS may be via a review of that vision; otherwise they will need to undertake a targeted visioning specific to the AAS development challenge.

Outputs: Key outputs are the community vision, action plan and action-plan outcome indicators. Another output is the report of proceedings that includes a community-level action plan, and this report is to be made available and accessible. A completed After Action Review.

Desired outcome: The beginning of community engagement and commitment to participation in the AAS program; developing a boundary object (the action plans) through which AAS can engage to support community aspirations.

Communication: Report back to the communities on the outcome of the interactions and what will happen next.

Activity 3.4 Develop initial hub-level Theory of Change

Purpose: The hub-level theory of change describes how the AAS hub team believes that AAS intervention can help achieve the hub vision of success. The hub-level ToC also helps the development of a scaling strategy by prioritizing preferred change pathways. This is one of the inputs that is used to formulate the 'program of work'. The assumptions and logic of the ToC will be periodically revisited.

Actors and participants: The DD team with help from AAS roll-out work group.

Inputs: The cumulative information from the Scoping Step, especially from Stakeholder Consultation Workshop.

Methods: One or two team members, with PESS/PSU support, produce an initial ToC based on guidance from the CPWF Monitoring and Evaluation Guide which includes a template/worked example of what the ToC should look like.. The DD team then critiques and improves it. The ToC should integrate issues of gender and other relevant topics that arise from the earlier planning outputs.

Questions for the team: Given everything that has been heard up to that point, what are the gaps, what are the leverage points that make sense?

The ToC writers obtain an evaluation of the document from the guiding coalition and program partners.

Outputs: The hub-level 'theory of change' document that includes suggested indicators for monitoring. A completed After Action Review.

Activity 3.5 Partner analysis
(continuing to build the intervention matrix)

Purpose and description: This activity will complete the inventory of programs (including those related to gender) in the hub from governmental or non-governmental agencies. The team will build on the existing information gathered by the scoping team, developing a more detailed picture of the nature, direction and scope of the work of potential program collaborators. Programs or projects whose activities fall outside the scope of the AAS-CRP but whose outputs or outcomes may have an indirect effect should also be recorded. One example would be a road- or bridge-building project that shortens farm-to-market travel.

Actors and participants: Led out of the DD team; individual knowledgeable of activities in the hub; key informants.

Inputs: Hub scoping report; network mapping from Stakeholder Consultation Workshop.

Methods: The projects or programs should be ranked in groups by degree of goal-sharing with the CRP and by their respective potential to become a partner. For the programs that are potential partners, basic descriptors of the programs should include: goals, outcomes and outputs, area of influence, target beneficiaries, duration of implementation, human resources, logistical support, key contacts, budget, donor, and contact information. This information can be collected using a template developed for the purpose. This information should be useful for the subsequent generation of the Existing Program Matrix (formerly known as the Intervention Matrix). If available, documentation of the program, reports, datasets or other literature may be collected. If available, additional criteria should be included such as: use of participatory techniques, gender orientation, or other criteria that assist the consideration of the program as a potential partner in the CRP.

The existing program matrix maps activities of existing programs into the themes of the AAS-CRP. For other programs a shorter set of information is sufficient.

Circulate the report to all partners for their feedback.

Outputs: An interpretative and summary report and database of existing programs. The Existing Program Matrix will be finalized later.

Activity 3.6 Gender analysis

Purpose: The hub- and community-level gender analysis aims to establish the existing gender dimensions of constraints, opportunities and development challenges as related to the six themes of the proposal. The analysis will reveal the potential for gender transformative action within the hub and target communities. This will help in identifying options to address the development challenge and achieve the hub vision of success while ensuring equity. This is one of the inputs that is used to formulate the 'program of work'.

This activity is in addition to the gender mainstreaming objectives. Gender mainstreaming seeks to assure consideration of gender perspectives in most planning and implementation activities.

Actors and participants: The DD team, with the country/ gender focal points taking the lead and with support from AAS roll-out work group.

Inputs: The cumulative information from the Scoping Step, previous information and baselines available. A gender analysis toolkit is being developed to define the type of information to be collected and how to collect it. It will be available in June.

Methods: The data collection will involve Rapid Rural Appraisal type approaches. The country gender focal points do an initial analysis. The AAS design team then critiques and improves it.

This analysis assists in design of the gender theme. The terms of reference (TOR) for the analysis should be based on the topics important in the Gender theme of the AAS proposal.

Outputs: Hub- and community-level diagnostic and descriptive reports.

Activity 3.7 Governance analysis and socioeconomic characteristics of the communities

Purpose and description: This activity builds directly on the Community Visioning and Action Planning (Activity 3.3), which will consider (from local perspectives) the current socio-economic characteristics of the community, vision, goals, and some analysis of *how* to pursue those goals. This should include a participatory analysis of what groups might support and what groups might oppose progress towards those goals. The present activity documents these findings and, where necessary, supplements them with additional information and analysis. The purpose is twofold:

1. The first is to characterize the communities in more detail with specific reference to the factors that are likely to be significant indicators of change – such as agro-ecological productivity and resilience, wealth and inequality, household income, childhood nutrition, seasonal food access, nutrition in females and children, etc. At this stage, the intent is to simply document what is already known and to identify areas where information is missing. This will help set the stage for a quantitative baseline survey to be carried out later.

2. The second is to characterize the governance context beyond the community level that is likely to influence success or failure in achieving program goals. Again, this draws directly on the participatory analysis undertaken during the Community Visioning and Action Planning. The purpose is to identify pathways to change that take into account the real institutional dynamics and power relationships at local and sub-national levels.

Actors and participants: Led by the DD team member that accompanies the community visioning and action-planning process. Methodological backstopping from Blake Ratner (WorldFish).

Inputs: Raw outputs of the Community Visioning and Action Planning; existing baseline and survey data; other community-level information from related planning efforts.

Method: This analysis assists the design of activities addressing the policy and governance theme. Portions of the TOR for the analysis should be based on the topics important in the policy/governance portion of the AAS proposal and the Drivers of Change analysis undertaken at national level. Rather than produce a general study of a community (or set of communities) in the hub, it is essential that the analysis focus on the factors most important in influencing success or failure in meeting program goals. Where feasible, a comparative approach that highlights differences and similarities in the governance context between communities (or even between hubs) is especially useful, as this helps hone in on pathways to influence.

The governance analysis focuses on three dimensions (stakeholder representation, distribution of authority, and mechanisms of accountability) and considers multiple scales, working outwards from the most immediate institutional context of the community. It also integrates consideration of the gendered nature of governance arrangements. Where bribery is endemic or women have more difficulty in obtaining land tenure, for example, the analysis asks why, and as such works outwards to consider the role of actors and institutions at sub-national and national level.

For guidance on analysis of the governance context, see Ratner, B.D., Barman, B., Cohen, P., Mam, K., Nagoli, J. and Allison, E.H. (2012) Strengthening governance across

scales in aquatic agricultural systems. Working Paper. The CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems, Penang, Malaysia. AAS-2012-10.

Outputs: A brief report (suggested 15 pages max) that describes the main conclusions, and the implications for program design. A version should be made available in the national language. Simple and direct language must be used to ensure that local stakeholders can review and validate or critique the main findings, whether by reviewing the text or discussing the conclusions. An appendix should describe key persons consulted and the methods of consultation.

STEP 4 – DESIGN

This phase utilizes the information gathered in the previous activities, and through analysis and synthesis followed by a consultation that ended with a proposed action plan for AAS in the hub. The proposed action plan was then evaluated via a partner-risk analysis and a drivers-of-change analysis.

The outputs at the conclusion of the design step are:
- an agreed proposal for the AAS program of work in the hub
- a three-year plan to implement
- a first-year operational plan and budget
- recommended indicators for M&E

Outcomes are:
- an understanding of the AAS approach
- a broadly shared vision by partners
- a commitment to partnership to achieve the vision

Three levels of a research-in-development agenda can emerge from the design process. One and two are driven by the community-based process. Three is the research agenda that is identified through the hub-level diagnosis.

1. Participatory action research at the level of the community. We will identify a research agenda that emerges from the community engagement. We should endeavor to pursue that agenda as a priority. We are the researchers participating in their processes.

2. Research that is done to benefit the agenda of the communities in the hub. The research may or may not be done in the hub.

3. Via the aggregation we identify and implement research on common themes across the hub – e.g., community-based fisheries management (CBFM) across all communities in the hub in the Solomon Islands. (This is driven primarily by the priorities from point 1). This is supporting research that is done at a larger scale.

4. The research that is 'pan hub' that we have identified.

These levels of research map into the scaling-out/scaling-up plan.

Timeline: This phase may last about two months.

Activity 4.1 Aggregation of community plans

Purpose and description: This analysis provides a cross-community look for common issues or other analytical points relevant to the design of the program. This step identifies commonalities and differences between the community action plans and potential intervention points for AAS research

Actors and participants: Led by the local facilitators and Constellation Coaches in consultation with the DD team.

Input: Community vision and action plans; partner analysis.

Method: Comparative analysis of the community-level action plans cross-referenced with other information from the diagnostic phase.

How can the research questions be extracted from what will be development-focused community plans?

Output – Identification of potential intervention points for AAS research.

Activity 4.2 Gap analysis and matrix of support

Purpose and description: This activity is a synthesis step to provide information for the design workshop. It uses information from the intervention matrix, the hub-level ToC and the aggregated community vision and action plans.

The intervention matrix provides a picture of 'supply'–that set of existing pro-poor research and development actions relevant to the program. The hub-level ToC and community action plans provide a picture of 'demand'. The gap analysis defines the match or mis-match of supply and demand. The objective of the gap analysis is to identify still un- or under-addressed topics, or areas of research-in-development within the scope of the AAS program. The aggregated community action plans establish priorities within this set of 'gaps' and thus serve as inputs to the design workshop.

The gap analysis encompasses not only the subject matter areas but also asks how the research is being done. This helps determine what is being done in agenda levels one or two.

Elements of the community action plans are not necessarily part of a research agenda. Those elements of the agenda are not part of the AAS funding priorities. We can direct this sort of demand to our partners.

Actors and participants: Led by the diagnosis and design team with support from the Roll-Out Working Group (ROWG).

Inputs: Hub intervention inventory, aggregated community action plans, Hub ToC.

Method: Compare these three sources of information to create the 'matrix of support'. The matrix is a two-dimensional representation of the current activities and priorities (as categorized by AAS themes) that emerged through the hub-level and community-level diagnoses.

Part of the gap analysis is to identify where the researcher or development partner should address the topic.

Outputs: Matrix of Support and synthesis report.

Activity 4.3 Design workshop

Purpose and description: The design workshop is where the work from the diagnosis phase is pulled together into a coherent program-of-work that the participants will seek to support through their collective efforts, coordinated by the AAS hub team. The program of work includes both research and development aspects of the hub- and community-level plans.

The design workshop can be small-big-small in three phases. The small is for the design team only (10 individuals). The big should add 10–15 more participants. The 10–15 more include those individuals from institutions that will be receiving budgets for activities from AAS funds, as well as individuals of cooperating stakeholders with projects designated as 'key' in the implementation matrix.

In the first phase the design team prepares a draft 'program of work' proposal, plus a suggested three-year plan of implementation.

The big workshop will adjust and validate the six- and three-year plans. The workshop will then go into detail and complete the first-year plan and budget.

In the third phase the design team takes the outputs from the workshop and finishes off the three-year plan. The work in this phase includes a stakeholder risk analysis.

Actors and participants: Led by the diagnosis and design team, facilitated by ROWG with participants coming from the guiding coalition identified and built in Activity 3.1.

Inputs: Outputs from Scoping and Diagnosis. Potential interventions for AAS research identified from community action plans; matrix of support.

Method: The workshop will begin with the design team meeting to agree a 'plausible promise' of what the AAS program-of-work might be. The design team will seek to match and prioritize actions that help the target communities implement their action plans while at the same time being consistent with the hub-level theory of

change. The assumptions and logic of the hub-level ToC will be reworded, based on what has been learned during diagnosis.

The 'plausible promise' is presented by the team to the larger workshop for validation, feedback and modification. Next steps are agreed, including the dates of the next meeting. The design team finalizes the proposal.

Part of the program design process should be risk analysis. Another aspect of risk analysis is to get a 'big shot' to look at the proposal and raise red flags.

Outputs: The 'Agreed proposal of a plan of work' is a six-year vision for the hub.

It includes the following:
* elements of proposal
* agreed hub-level gendered theory of change
* intervention matrix
* partnership strategy and partnership commitments
* communications plan
* M&E plan
* baseline survey and impact assessment plan
* gender transformation plan
* scaling-up/scaling-out plan

The three-year plan includes:
* output and outcome planning
* indicative budget

The first-year operational plan includes:
* first year logframe
* activity budget

Communication: Communication plan for hub/country. Two-stage process – during roll-out need to communicate, and then later during implementation.

Big communication moments (whenever we are interacting with the partners/stakeholders with whom we will be interacting during the next many years):
* scoping study
* stakeholder consultation workshop
* community engagement

Activity 4.4 Hub team orientation and training

Purpose and description: This activity seeks to build skills for implementation of the AAS approach among the hub teams. The AAS program seeks to not do 'business-as-usual'. Elements of this change include action research and the ethics around it, gender mainstreaming and gender transformative goals, program learning, communications, reflection and adaptation via M&E, performance indicators developed jointly with communities and shared monitoring

of them. Most hub teams will not have a shared knowledge of these practices or skills to implement them.

Actors and participants: Led by DD team; trainers from ROWG; participants selected from design workshop.

Inputs: Primer modules developed for DD team orientation and training; capacity building needs.

Methods: Short in-service capacity building on priority topics.

Outputs: Improved capacity among hub team members.

Activity 4.5 In-country after-action review of roll-out process

Purpose and description: In this activity the DD team reflects on the roll-out process – to agree on what worked and what didn't and to recommend changes to the roll-out process in other hubs.

Actors and participants: DD team

Inputs: Collective experience of the roll-out process; after-action reviews carried out after individual activities.

Methods: Facilitated 1-day meeting. Using activity After Action Reviews as input, the DD team carries out a meta-level AAR of the whole roll-out process.

Outputs: Report of the AAR comprising the overall hub roll-out process.

Activity 4.6 Three-hub AAR in Penang to inform roll-out in new hubs

Purpose and description: To pull together the learning about how to do hub roll-outs from Zambia, Solomon Islands and Bangladesh and to agree changes and improvements to future roll-out. To familiarize future hub leaders with the roll-out process.

Actors and participants: Selected members from DD teams from the three hubs; ROWG; selected PLT members.

Inputs: Hub AAR reports.

Methods: Facilitated 2-day meeting to address agreed research questions.

Outputs: Version 2 of the Roll-Out Handbook; journal article; future hub leaders familiarized with what to expect in hub roll-out.

ANNEX 1: SUMMARY OF ROLL-OUT ACTIVITIES

	Activity	Who?	Methods	Input	Output
0	Initial Scoping in 2011				
1	Roll-Out Planning				
1.1	Develop Roll-Out Handbook	Roll-out Working Group (ROWG)	Developed as a living document	AAS Proposal;	The Handbook itself
1.2	Program Leadership Team Meeting	PLT	Facilitated workshop	AAS Proposal; handbook	Meeting outputs on Wikispace
1.3	Roll-Out Planning Workshop	Roll-Out Working Group	4-day meeting in Penang	AAS Proposal; Zambia Scoping Report; handbook	Roll-out plans for hubs in Zambia, Bangladesh and Solomons
1.4	Documentation and monitoring of roll-out process	Country information manager; M&E point person, country leader	Regular ROWG progress meetings. Use of country repositories; expectation to document	Information on all roll-out processes, trip reports, workshop reports, AARs after each activity	Processes documented; progress monitored; data and information
1.5	Partner engagement and communications	Country leader; hub leader; key partners (the usual suspects)	Communication, working the back channels, lobbying, convincing	Existing partnerships, network capital	Signed MOUs; strengthened partnerships
2	Scoping				
2.1	Analysis of AAS Program in National Setting	Consultant or country team member	Desk study	AAS CRP proposal; initial country scoping reports; existing data and literature	Report
2.1.1	Drivers of change analysis	Consultant or country team member	"Drivers of change approach", informed judgment	AAS CRP proposal; initial country scoping reports; existing data and literature	Report
2.2	Hub Scoping	Team of 5 to 10 (?) led by Country Leader	5 – 10 day hub visit	AAS proposal; initial country scoping reports	Hub scoping Report
2.3	Selection and invitation of Stakeholder Consultation Workshop participants	Country Leader	Country leader decision	Recommendation from Hub Scoping Report	Invitations sent; follow-up
2.4	Stakeholder Consultation Workshop	CL and team; PSU/PESS; invited participants	Facilitated participatory decision-making	Analysis of National Setting; Hub Scoping Report	Workshop Report
3	Diagnosis				
3.1	a) Select and build a diagnosis and design (DD) team; b) build the guiding coalition	a) CL and Roll-Out WG; b) DD team	a) CL selects DD team with help from Roll-Out WG. b) Guiding Coalition built by DD team	Partner intelligence gathered during Scoping	DD team; Guiding Coalition
3.1.1	Orient and train DD team in AAS concepts	PSU, PESS, DD team	In-hub, in service training events	Trainers (from PESS, PSU)	A team with capacity; shared vision; cohesion
3.2	Confirm community selection	DD team and Roll-Out WG	Analysis of Scoping results	Scoping results, especially from Stakeholder Consultation Workshop	Communities selected
3.2.1	Identify and train community facilitators	DD team, partner CBOs, community facilitators, Constellation coaches	Constellation 5 day training; other training requirements met	Selection methods; Constellation training modules with gender included	Gender balanced team of local community facilitators; DD team able to support
3.3	Community Visioning and Action Planning	Communities, constellation coaches, community facilitators; DD team	Adapted Appreciative Inquiry	Community selection	Community visions and action plans
3.4	Develop first approx hub-level TOC	DD team and Roll-Out WG	Template available/ worked example	Outputs from Stakeholder Consultation Workshop	Draft ToC

	Activity	Who?	Methods	Input	Output
3.5	Partner Analysis	Led by DD team; consultant; key informants	Desk study; some key informant interviews	Hub scoping report; network mapping from SCW	Report and database
3.6	Gender Analysis				
		Led by gender focal point, DD team, ROWG	RRA-type gender analysis	Info to date; Gender checklists and tools	Hub- and community-level reports
3.7	Governance and socio-economic characterization of communities	Consultant; backstopped by Blake Ratner	Al la Ratner et al 2012	Raw output from CVAP; existing baseline and survey data	Report
4	Design				
4.1	Aggregation of community plans	Led by Constellation; DD team	Comparative analysis and synthesis	Community visions and action plans; info from diagnosis	Identification of potential intervention points for AAS research
4.2	Gap Analysis and Matrix of Support	DD team supported by ROWG	Comparative analysis across inventory, action plans and ToC	Hub intervention inventory, aggregated community action plans, Hub TOC	Matrix of support and synthesis document
4.3	Design Workshop	Led by DD team, facilitated by ROWG; guiding coalition	Facilitated participatory decision making	Outputs from Scoping and Diagnosis. Potential interventions; matrix of support	Agreed proposal of a plan of work
4.4	Hub team orientation and training	Led by DD team; trainers from ROWG; participants selected from design workshop	Workshop; short in-service capacity building on priority topics.	Primer modules developed for DD team orientation and training; capacity building needs identified by DD team	A team with capacity; shared vision; cohesion
4.5	In-country after action review of roll-out	Led by DD team, facilitated by ROWG	After action review		
The experience of the whole process	Lessons and improvements for next round of roll-outs				
4.6	Overall after action review	Led by ROWG; members of DD teams; CLs from Cambodia and Philippines	Ditto	After action reviews from countries	Ditto

ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TEAM MEMBER

The members of the expert team will be selected for their broad understanding of the development issues and opportunities in the hub, of past and on-going development efforts, and for their ability to ask hard questions about the added value of the program in this context. Gender balance should be a goal in team selection.

In visiting the hubs each team will validate the development challenge, hypothesis of change and research questions in the proposal and revise as necessary.

Data collection activities may include a review of hub-level secondary data and literature, field visits, focus group (with separate men and women groups where possible and appropriate) semi-structured interviews and key informant interviews.

To assure adequate coverage of gender related issues in the analysis the scoping team will use a gender check list. However, it should be underlined here that gender desegregated data/information gathering will be a common thread throughout the scoping.

ANNEX 3: PROPOSED AGENDA FOR STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION WORKSHOP

Participants:
- 20 – 35 invited participants from main stakeholder groupings (e.g., research, government, CBOs, private sector (?), development sector). Their selection is key to the success and legitimacy of the workshop. An important result of Scoping is to guide and inform this selection.
- Country team
- Bioversity and IWMI representatives
- Constellation facilitator
- PESS/PSU/Communications team

Objectives:
- Build partner understanding of and commitment to tackling the development challenge
- Identify, validate and endorse constraints and opportunities facing the hub
- Develop a shared vision of success based on tackling the development challenge

- Benchmark where stakeholder groups see themselves with respect to tackling the development challenge
- Identify key opportunities for partnership and network strengthening
- Provide input necessary to select communities and build Hub Theory of Change

Outputs:
- Prioritized opportunities and constraints by main stakeholder groupings
- Inventory of recent and on-going initiatives relevant to addressing the hub development challenge
- Visions of success, by main stakeholder groupings
- Self assessment carried out by different stakeholder groups of where they are with respect to achieving their dream
- Network mapping, including of power, influence and attitude to the HDC, by main stakeholder groupings
- Scoping findings shared with and validated by stakeholders
- Initial proposal and feedback on what AAS might work on

Agenda Overview
The workshop has the following blocks:

1. Introductions, scene-setting and expectations

i. To AAS as a program and a system

ii. The Hub Development Challenge

iii. Scoping findings

iv. Expectations

v. Each other, including organizations represented in workshop

vi. Survey of ongoing initiatives

2. Identification of opportunities

i. Concerns (or problem tree analysis)

ii. Opportunities to address concerns

3. Vision of hub and community success in addressing the HDC after 6 years

4. Stakeholder self-assessment of where they are with respect to their dream

i. Self-assessment

ii. Prioritization

iii. iii. Action planning

5. Network mapping and identification of opportunities for network strengthening

6. Community selection
7. Findings of the AAS Scoping Study
8. What the AAS Program-of-Work might look like
9. Next steps
10. Workshop evaluation and closure

Roles and responsibilities in the Workshop

The people who will play these roles must be identified before each workshop and participants should know who they are.

- Senior program representative - the person who represents the global program with responsibility to ensure coherence to agreed program objectives and processes
- Workshop owner - the Country Program leader who is inviting people and has to live with the results. The person with the final say about what can or can't happen.
- Lead facilitator - the person who is responsible for delivering the the process that will produce the objectives agreed with the Country Program Leader. Normally from PESS
- Co-facilitators - people who help the lead facilitator. Normally the facilitation team would agree the agenda and process but in case of disagreement the lead facilitator has the final say.
- Note-takers - people with responsibility for capturing content to provide to the DD team to develop hub theory of change, to PESS for network analysis, for writing the workshop report and developing material for communication outreach

Room requirements and layout

The workshop room should be large enough to fit seven groups of 6 people working around large tables (2m x 1.5m) with sufficient space between them. Please note, the tables should be moveable, not fixed, as we'll want to re-arrange them. There must be provision to hang flip charts on the walls. The room should be set up room with PowerPoint projector and screen at the front. Set up tables with maximum of 6 people per table for group work in afternoon of first day. Arrange chairs so all can see the front for the morning of the first day.

Materials

- one PowerPoint projector and white wall or screen to project onto
- extension cables for PowerPoint Projector and for people to work on lap-tops (5 should be sufficient)
- assorted marker pens (preferably water-soluble) 60 in all
- seven rolls of masking tape (paper tape, as used in participatory-type workshops)

- seven sets of cardboard cards (10cm x 20cm roughly) in 4 colours, 40 cards per set 280 cards in total)
- seven sets of "Post-its", square, about 5cm x 5cm in four colours, the same colours as the cards (7 x 4 = 28 packets in all)
- a big pair of scissors (for cutting the cards if necessary)
- two flip-chart stands
- lots of flip chart paper (50 pieces)

Facilitators' detailed workshop agenda

Day 0

Facilitators' and hub team pre-workshop meeting to review preparations (venue, materials) and workshop agenda for the three days and agree the detailed agenda for Day 1

Start time	Activity	Purpose	Responsible
Day 1			
	1	Introductions, scene-setting and expectations	
0900	Welcome	The leaders of the hosting organizations and the hosting venue welcome participants on behalf of themselves and AAS and explain the purpose and importance of the workshop	Leaders of hosting orgs
0910	Introduction to AAS as a program and a system and the hub development challenge	CPL and or Senior Program Rep. presents the CGIAR, CRPs and AAS as a program (10-15 mins) CPL describes • road map for setting up the AAS program including scoping work to date and where the SCW fits • what is meant by aquatic agricultural systems • justification for the hub development challenge and the focus it gives	Country program leader; senior program rep.
	Objectives and overview of workshop agenda	Short presentation followed by Q&A	Facilitator
	Participant expectations	Participants share their expectations giving an opportunity for workshop owner and facilitators to respond and realign expectations if necessary. Can be dropped if short of time	Facilitator
1030	Coffee		
	Participant introductions	Participants know who is in the room and what organizations are represented.	Facilitator
	Survey of initiatives	Participants complete a brief questionnaire on existing projects/programs in the hub. Ask people to fill them in during lunch and collect forms after lunch. Optional - depending on whether this information has already been gathered as part of Scoping	Facilitator
1230	Lunch	During lunch facilitators decide how to divide	
	2	Identification of concerns and the strengths/opportunities to address them	
1330	Concerns (or Problem Analysis)	Participants identify pressing concerns with respect to HDC (module available). Facilitator may chose to do this through a problem tree analysis. See Problem Analysis Module	Facilitator; note-taker
1500	Coffee		
1530	Strengths and opportunities to address concerns	Participants identify and present back to plenary strengths and opportunities to address concerns, who needs to be involved and where	Facilitator; note-taker
1700	Review of Day 1	Go-around	
Day 2			
	3	Vision of hub and community success in addressing the HDC after 10 years	
0830	Welcome	Summary of previous day, present agenda for Day 2	Facilitator

0845	Visioning - group work	Module available	Facilitator; groups
0945	Plenary presentation and discussion of visions		Facilitator; note-taker
1030	Coffee		
	4	Self-assessment of community, organizational and collaborative competence in addressing concerns	
1050	Self-assessment	Module available	Constellation facilitator
1200	Plenary presentations and discussion		Ditto, plus note-taker
1230	Lunch		Core team
	5	Network mapping and identification of opportunities for network strengthening	
1330	Network mapping including mapping of power and influence	Module available. Introduction to concepts and exercise; then Stakeholder groupings map the network of actors whose work is relevant to the HDC; Groups consider who are the powerful actors and who will support and who might be threatened by a collaborative effort to address the HDC	Facilitator
1530	Coffee		
1550	Opportunities for network strengthening; collective action	Groups identify key network opportunities and risks and identify concrete actions to exploit / mitigate	Facilitator; groups
	Plenary presentations and discussion	Plenary presentation of maps, power and influence and opportunities to improve collaboration	Facilitator; note taker
1700	Review of Day 2		Facilitator
Day 3			
	6	Community selection	
0830	Welcome	Summary of previous day, present agenda for Day 2	
0845	Community selection and scaling up	Plenary presentation of different ways AAS might choose first and second order communities	Country Program Leader

0915	Group work followed by report back	Small groups make recommendations for type of communities to select and criteria for selecting them; plenary discussion	Facilitator; note taker
1030	Coffee		
	7	Scoping study results	
1050	Plenary presentation	Comparing and contrasting scoping study findings with what has come out of the workshop	Hub staff
1130	Discussion	Plenary discussion of similarities and differences to identify strengths and limitations of Scoping Study	Facilitator
1200	Lunch		
	8	What the AAS program might look like	
1300	Plenary presentation	Reflection back of what is emerging from the workshop by AAS country and global program	Country Program Leader and Senior Program Rep.
1330	Group discussion; plenary sharing	Discussion of proposal to validate, add to or challenge the proposal	Facilitator
	9	Next steps and parking lot issues	
1400	Parking lot issues	Open space to deal with parked issues	Facilitator
1430	Nest steps including communication	Map out a timeline, agree how to communicate next steps and who should get what output from the workshop	Facilitator
1500	Coffee		
	10	Workshop closure and evaluation	
1600	Workshop evaluation and closure	After action review followed by closing remarks	Country Program Leader; Facilitator

After workshop review (1hr)

Facilitation and hub team carry out an after action review based on workshop evaluation straight after the workshop

ANNEX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE DIAGNOSIS AND DESIGN (DD) TEAM

The DD team is responsible for:

1. Accompanying and ensuring coherence of the diagnosis step

2. AAS program design

3. Building the guiding coalition by championing AAS to their respective networks and feeding network expectations into the design

4. Individually and collectively carrying out diagnosis and design activities assigned to the team

The DD team leader is responsible for selecting the team. Team members will be representatives of the key AAS stakeholders and selected based on interest and skills identified during the scoping step. Team size will likely be 5 - 8, including the country gender focal points and the M&E / information management focal points. For those DD team members that are not WorldFish employees, a MOU or a more or less formalized contract should be established that specifies the expected level of participation and time commitment required. It is expected that some members will have more time than others and play a correspondingly larger role.

Team leader responsibilities:
- Convene team
- Develop team action plan in consultation with the members, including assuming leadership of a number of the activities
- Assign individual and shared responsibilities to team members
- Call and convene meetings
- Ensure process is documented and, in particular that After Action Reviews are carried out

Team member responsibilities:
- Attend meetings called by the DD team leader
- Attend the in-country DD team training
- One member to accompany the community visioning and action planning, including attending training of community facilitators; this member will also lead the governance analysis

- A sub-group develop hub-level ToC before validation by whole team
- Lead the partner analysis
- Participate in gender analysis, led by gender focal point
- Participate with Constellation in the aggregation of community action plans
- Carry out gap analysis and construct matrix of support
- Lead the Design workshop
- Identify members for the Hub team to lead AAS implementation
- Lead Hub team orientation and training
- Lead the AAR of the in-country Rollout process

Team member capacities
- Familiar in AAS concepts (after the orientation workshop)
- Sufficient time and commitment to play the role
- Willing to champion AAS on one hand while seeking feedback and constructive criticism to improve team and AAS performance

RESEARCH PROGRAM ON

Aquatic Agricultural Systems

CGIAR

The CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems is a multi-year research initiative launched in July 2011. It is designed to pursue community based approaches to agricultural research and development that target the poorest and most vulnerable rural households in aquatic agricultural systems. The Program is partnering with diverse organizations working at local, national and global levels to help achieve impacts at scale. The CGIAR Lead Center of the Program is the WorldFish Center in Penang, Malaysia. For more information, visit *aas.cgiar.org*

Contact Details

Find out more by scanning this QR code with your smartphone's QR code reader.